

Population Policy in Hawaii

Robert C. Schmitt

When Governor John A. Burns appointed the Hawaii State Temporary Commission on Population Stabilization early in 1971, many observers acclaimed his action as one of considerable historic significance. This was the first time, they noted, that Hawaii—or, indeed, any of the fifty United States—had created an official body explicitly concerned with broad population policy.¹

While such a commission was unquestionably unique in Hawaii and its sister states, the formulation of population policy was by no means a new activity in the Hawaiian Islands. The Hawaiian government had evolved a well recognized set of population policies by the middle of the 19th century, and had periodically extended or modified these policies through the closing years of the monarchy, the establishment of the republic, annexation as an American territory, and the attainment of statehood. The Commission's report was able to touch on this history only in passing, however, and no comprehensive review of this rich background has so far appeared in print.

The following account is based on a relatively broad definition of "population policy." Sometimes narrowly defined as "policies explicitly adopted by governments for their (presumed) demographic consequences," population policy is here conceived to encompass any government policy, adopted for whatever purpose, that does in fact influence the size, geographic distribution, or composition of population, or the components of population change, that is, births, deaths, or migration.²

THE STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL

Hawaii's first contact with the outside world was followed by a century of rapid decline. Perhaps 250,000 inhabitants occupied the 6,425-square mile

Robert C. Schmitt is State Statistician, Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development, and formerly member, Temporary Commission on Population Stabilization.

archipelago when Captain James Cook and his men arrived in 1778. When the first band of American missionaries reached Hawaii forty-two years later, they found fewer than 150,000 Islanders, and the first complete official census, conducted in 1850, reported a total population of only 84,165, including foreigners. An all-time low of 53,900 was reached in 1876, although the native decline continued into the 20th century. The causes of this depopulation included high rates of sterility and stillbirths (caused chiefly by venereal diseases), infanticide, warfare, famine, and epidemics of cholera, influenza, measles, mumps, whooping cough, smallpox, and other diseases. Deaths greatly outnumbered births, and emigration exceeded immigration.³

By the middle of the 19th century this rapid and uncontrolled decline was recognized as the most pressing and intractable problem confronting the government and business community of Hawaii. Soaring mortality and plummeting labor force called into question the viability and very existence of the nation and its economic survival. To the missionaries, moreover, the prevalence of abortion, infanticide and sexual license posed grave moral problems.

Attention was initially directed toward infanticide. Following his tour of Hawaii in 1823, William Ellis wrote:

The king, and some of the chiefs, especially Karaimoku, since they have attended to the precepts of Christianity, and have been made acquainted with the direct prohibitions of it [infanticide] in the Bible, have readily expressed in public their conviction of its criminality, and that committing it is in fact *pepehi kanaka*, (to kill man) under circumstances which aggravate its guilt. They have also been led to see its impolicy with respect to their resources, in its tendency to depopulate the islands, and render them barren or unprofitable, and, from these views, have lately exerted themselves to suppress it.⁴

Infanticide was outlawed in 1835 and within a few years was no longer regarded as a serious problem.⁵ Induced abortion, likewise a common practice when the missionaries first arrived, was declared a criminal offense in 1850. The abortion law remained in effect until 1970.⁶

Introduced diseases and the resulting high death rates caused special concern. Kamehameha III promulgated quarantine laws and authorized the appointment of local boards of health as early as 1839, and on December 13, 1850 his Privy Council appointed the first such board with island-wide responsibilities.⁷ His successor, Kamehameha IV, addressed the opening session of the 1855 legislature on "the decrease of our population," of which he said, "It is a subject, in comparison with which all others sink into insignificance." He specifically recommended the establishment of public hospitals, and pointed to the need of preventing the introduction of diseases from abroad. The legislators responded by providing for the support of the Board of Health, redefining its powers and duties, and authorizing the establishment of hospitals on the principal islands "for the sick poor, being natives of this kingdom." Further legislation in 1859, plus strong personal support by the royal family, resulted in the opening of The Queen's Hospital in Honolulu later that year. In 1865 the legislature passed "An Act to Prevent

the Spread of Leprosy” and established facilities for the care of leprosy patients at Kalihi and Kalawao.⁸ Public hospitals were later built in Wailuku, Koloa and Hilo, and several private hospitals were granted continuing governmental subsidies.⁹

There was also much concern with the low birth rate and the related problem of exceptionally high infant mortality rates. Some leaders recommended an infusion of non-Hawaiian blood. Kuykendall reports that “the king in his speech to the legislature in 1850 gave utterance to the view of the government when he said, ‘It is clearly the interest of the Islands to encourage intermarriages between the natives and respectable foreigners.’”¹⁰ Five years later, on a similar occasion, Kamehameha IV recommended to the legislators that they take steps not only to reduce the loss caused by disease but also to “bring in Polynesian immigrants to reinforce and reinvigorate the native Hawaiian stock.”¹¹ King Kalakaua adopted a more outspoken pro-natalist stance: campaigning for election in 1872, he promised to act “to preserve and increase the people, so that they shall multiply and fill the land with chiefs and common people,” and after his inauguration in February 1874 he announced that the motto of his reign would be “*Hooulu Lahui*” (Propagate and Perpetuate the Race). To this end he formed a benevolent society by that name. Headed by Queen Kapiolani, the society founded Kapiolani Maternity Home in 1890, so that “Hawaiian women can receive proper care and treatment during the period of child-birth.”¹²

The large loss from out-migration likewise received official attention during the middle of the century. Many Hawaiians had gone to sea aboard whaling ships or had gone to California to seek gold, and relatively few ever returned to the Islands. Legislation was accordingly enacted in 1850 to impose strict curbs on such emigration. This law was repealed in 1859, re-enacted in 1864, and repealed again in 1887.¹³

The continuing decline might have been stemmed, or at least moderated, by increased immigration, but such a possibility was accorded minimal high-level support before 1850. Opposition to large-scale immigration was evident not only among Island leaders but also in the general population. The missionaries, for example, feared that “an inevitable influx of foreign population, induced only by the love of pleasure and gain, would doubtless hasten the waste of the aborigines.” The chiefs feared “the foreign domination which would inevitably result from a too great increase in the number and wealth of the foreign population,” foreseeing “the decline of their own power with the increase of whites.” And the common people expressed “a deep seated fear of foreign economic and political domination which might lead to the subjection and obliteration of the native Hawaiians.”¹⁴

THE SEARCH FOR FOREIGN LABOR

Official attitudes toward immigration changed appreciably after 1850. While native decline, low fertility and high mortality continued to elicit deep

concern, governmental attention began to focus more and more strongly on the encouragement of immigration. The policies that evolved during this period endured until 1946.

This shift in emphasis had both economic and demographic causes. The principal economic activities in Hawaii during the first half of the century were subsistence agriculture and fishing, the sandalwood trade, and the provisioning and servicing of the whaling fleet. In spite of its rapid decline, the Hawaiian labor force seemed to be adequate for this kind of work. In 1835, however, the first successful sugar plantation in the Islands was organized, to be joined within a few years by many others. The rapid growth in this new industry resulted in a heavy demand for laborers, at the very time that the native labor force was in steep decline. An acute shortage of sugar workers quickly became evident.

Both governmental and business leaders agreed that the plantations would have to turn to foreign labor. In his speech at the opening of the 1850 legislative session, Kamehameha III said, "The prosperity of the Islands and their altered position relatively to Oregon and California require a greatly increased cultivation of the soil, which will not be possible without the aid of foreign capital and labor." The Royal Hawaiian Agricultural Society, formally organized later that year, agreed on the need to bring in foreign workers, and arranged for the importation of nearly 200 Chinese. This group arrived on January 3, 1852, the first of approximately 400,000 immigrants who would come to Hawaii over the next 95 years.¹⁵ Further support for importing labor came from the Planters' Society in 1864, numerous speeches by the king, and a wide range of government officials and businessmen.¹⁶

The legislature quickly moved to expedite the new policy. As Kuykendall noted, "An Act for the Government of Masters and Servants", passed June 21, 1850, was of special importance because it provided the legal basis for the contract labor system which existed in Hawaii throughout the second half of the nineteenth century."¹⁷ A law enacted on December 30, 1864 created a Bureau of Immigration, with responsibility for superintending the importation of foreign laborers, regulating the contracts to be made with such laborers, and promoting and encouraging immigration from abroad.¹⁸ Sizable appropriations were made in support of the immigration program, more than matching the amounts provided by the planters and immigrants themselves; between 1864 and 1886, for example, the government expended \$1,079,797 while the planters and others spent \$631,078.¹⁹

Although many regarded immigration as simply a means of obtaining needed labor, others looked to it to reverse the still unchecked population decline. The goals of the two groups sometimes seemed to be incompatible, and those whose primary interest was repopulation often felt compelled to assert their own priorities. S. B. Dole, later president of the Hawaiian Republic, told a planters' meeting in 1869: "I oppose the [contract labor] system from principle, because I think it is wrong. . . . I cannot help feeling that the chief end of this meeting, its heart and soul, is plantation profits; and the prosperity

of the country, the demands of society, the future of the Hawaiian race only come in secondarily if at all, on the part of the supporters of the system."²⁰

Certain desirable characteristics were frequently stressed. Many urged that immigrants come chiefly from "cognate races," a term that initially referred to other Polynesians but later came to include Micronesians, Melanesians, Malaysians, and even Japanese. Efforts to recruit South Sea Islanders met with little success, however.²¹ Other desirable characteristics mentioned in the on-going debate included a balanced sex ratio (most of the earlier migrants were single males), a willingness to settle permanently (many returned home after a few years), and the ability to "assimilate" with the local population.²²

The sugar planters meanwhile promoted ethnic diversity, initially in reaction to what they regarded as an overconcentration of Chinese and later to the predominance of Japanese. One group in 1883 frankly spoke of the need for "an *offset* to the Chinese . . . having our labor *mixed* . . . less danger of collusion among laborers . . . better discipline. . . ." Lind has remarked that "Several of the smaller ethnic groups were introduced in the decade following Annexation, partly as foils to the large Japanese population. . . . By the time the Filipinos appeared on the Hawaiian scene, it was no longer necessary to justify the importation on the grounds of solving a population problem. The disastrous effects of the 1909 strike gave the planters good reason to seek relief from the near monopoly of plantation labor by the Japanese."²³

A good deal of popular opposition to the immigrants eventually developed, and especially to the Chinese. Some criticized the contract labor law as a form of serfdom. Others complained about the sex imbalance of the newcomers, their alleged predisposition to opium and crime, or their inability to assimilate. Blue-collar Hawaiians and Caucasians objected to low-wage competition by the Chinese. Restrictive legislation was enacted in both 1888 and 1892.²⁴

The search for immigrant labor continued for almost half a century more following annexation to the United States in 1898, but the emphasis inevitably shifted. As an independent nation, Hawaii had been able to set its own policy; as an American territory, however, it had to defer to laws and policies determined in Washington. By 1907, moreover, birth rates had overtaken death rates, and repopulation was no longer an important consideration in the choice of immigrants.²⁵

The Board of Immigration, a casualty of annexation, was revived in 1905. The new board was authorized to advertise for new residents, pay for their passage, and arrange for their reception. In 1911 the agency was reorganized as the Department of Immigration, Labor and Statistics, with the addition of a fact-finding function. Not long thereafter the outbreak of World War I seriously hampered its recruitment activities, the legislature drastically curtailed its budget, and after 1917 the agency became inactive. A 1931 law abolished the long-defunct department and transferred some of its powers to the Secretary of the Territory, where they reposed, little used, until final repeal in 1955.²⁶

The planters and Territorial officials turned from the Orient to Europe and then to the Philippines for workers. Before 1900 most of the immigrants had

come from China, Portugal and Japan. Thereafter recruitment efforts were focused successively on Puerto Rico, Korea, Spain, and Russia. A federal report published in 1914 observed:

It has been regarded as desirable in the past to encourage the settlement in Hawaii of European aliens and correspondingly to discourage the settlement there of aliens from the Orient, the idea being that the former does and the latter does not tend toward the "Americanization" of the Territory, which already has a large Asiatic population. . . . The thorough "Americanization" of Hawaii is a matter which demands serious consideration and careful and prompt action.²⁷

War, depression and federal legislation were the dominant influences in Hawaiian immigration during the succeeding decades. As previously noted, World War I effectively terminated recruitment in Europe. Federal immigration laws enacted in 1921 and 1924 set an annual quota of as few as 1,400 Asians for the nation as a whole, thereby cutting off Hawaii's major source for labor.²⁸ A Hawaii Emergency Labor Commission was created in 1921, and Congress was asked to allow the Islands to admit otherwise inadmissible aliens, for limited times, for agricultural labor and domestic service.²⁹ Filipinos, first brought in in 1907, were still eligible under the new federal legislation, and arrived in great numbers during the 1920s. After 1931 the deepening depression stopped virtually all immigration, except for a supplementary importation of Filipinos in 1946 to ease the plantation labor shortage caused by World War II.³⁰

The immigration policy which thus reached its natural end was in many respects a successful one. It had obviously satisfied the needs of plantation agriculture: by 1930 some 63,000 persons, almost half of the gainfully employed persons in the Territory, worked in the sugar and pineapple fields and other agricultural enterprises of the Islands. Immigration had also reversed the century-long population decline, raising the total count (in the face of an excess of deaths over births) from 53,900 in 1876 to 154,000 in 1900 and 423,000 in 1940. And intermarriage with the newcomers had indeed "reinvigorated" the dying Hawaiians; although unmixed Hawaiians dropped from 82,035 in 1850 to 14,375 in 1940, part Hawaiians rose from 558 to 49,935 during the same 90-year period.³¹

STERILIZATION AND CONTRACEPTION

The rise of the family planning movement in Hawaii dates from the late 1920s and early 1930s. Proponents of family planning stressed the need to reduce the number of unwanted births, variously citing reasons of economics, eugenics, or health. Both contraception and sterilization were urged. Such practices were presumably known to Hawaii long before the '20s, although seldom mentioned in polite discourse.

Most of the early advocates of birth limitation seemed to be interested primarily in preventing the propagation of the "unfit." Papers presented to the Medical Society of Hawaii and Honolulu Social Science Society pointed to

the prevalence of feeble-mindedness, insanity, venereal disease, alcoholism, "degeneracy," crime, divorce, poverty and unemployment, and recommended the use of birth control, enforced celibacy, and sterilization to reduce such conditions.³² More than a decade later the Board of Prison Directors and Territorial Conference of Social Work urged "sterilization of defective persons who are potential parents of defective offspring" on grounds of "individual welfare and Territorial self-protection."³³ Similar recommendations were made by prominent physicians, a Territorial grand jury, and other groups.³⁴

This concern with eugenics eventually reached the Territorial Legislature. As early as 1913 a bill was introduced (but not passed) providing "that before a marriage license could be obtained, both parties should present a Certificate of Health from a reliable physician."³⁵ Some years later a Manoa women's group calling themselves the Central Committee on Child Welfare considered "sterilizing the feeble-minded in general and those in Waimano Home in particular. They went so far as to get a legislative bill drafted for the purpose" but eventually decided "to refer the matter to the Honolulu County Medical Society—there it died a natural death."³⁶ At a still later date, on February 18, 1933, Senator H. W. Rice introduced a bill "to restrict the procreation of socially inadequate persons" by sterilizing anyone classified as "a feeble-minded, insane and/or epileptic person, idiot, imbecile, or moral degenerate, or person of habitual criminality." This bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 10 to 3 and then sent to the House of Representatives, where a Committee of the Whole recommended passage. Amid great public controversy, the House postponed action numerous times, and finally, on May 19, "indefinitely."³⁷ Thereafter, support for sterilization on eugenic grounds seemed to wane, and the issue received little mention in the Honolulu press.

This did not mean lessened interest in family planning, however, but only a shift in methods and rationale. Most writers now stressed health and economic considerations as reasons for restricting fertility, and emphasized contraception in preference to sterilization. In 1929, for example, the governor of the Territory, president of the Board of Health, and executive committee of the United Welfare Fund jointly requested the American Public Health Association to undertake a survey of health and welfare in Honolulu. This survey recommended, among other things, "that special clinics be organized where feasible, under the laws of the Territory, at which advice as to contraceptive measures may be given to women who for medical reasons or the good of the community are in need of such council."³⁸ Studies of plantation workers and their families conducted by Dr. Nils P. Larsen and his associates during the 1930s revealed a close association between malnutrition and family size and stimulated considerable interest in family planning in rural areas.³⁹

As a result of this growing concern, private hospitals, welfare agencies and plantations began to offer counseling and services in contraception and sterilization. The first such services were provided on the plantations in 1929, and were considerably extended during the following decade.⁴⁰ In Honolulu, Palama Settlement established a male sterilization clinic in 1930 and a mother's

health (birth control) clinic in 1931, and The Queen's Hospital reported a Maternal Health and Birth Control Clinic in full operation by 1932.⁴¹

These steps were not made without opposition, however, and it is not surprising that family planning depended on private initiative until the mid-1960s. While the Territorial Conference on Social Work, the Hawaii Territorial Medical Association, and other professional groups supported family planning, the Holy Name Society of Honolulu and Roman Catholic clergy vigorously opposed the movement.⁴²

Although the effectiveness of the programs thus introduced is hard to assess, there is no question that the crude birth rate dropped sharply during 1930s. This reduction combined with a net out-migration to reduce population growth rates to their lowest levels in more than half a century.

FINDING JOBS FOR SURPLUS WORKERS

World War II and its aftermath drastically altered demographic conditions in Hawaii. By the middle of 1940, the federal government had embarked on a crash program to build up its Army and Navy bases in the Islands, and was recruiting thousands of civilian workers from both Hawaii and the Mainland to man these installations. An even greater horde of uniformed personnel joined the civilian population after the Pearl Harbor attack. The shrinkage after VJ-Day was equally dramatic, and, combined with mechanization on the plantations, a series of major strikes, and a Mainland recession produced soaring unemployment rates and a net out-migration that persisted until 1954.

These abrupt shifts are clearly revealed by official statistics. Total population rose from 423,000 in April 1940 to 859,000 in mid-1944, then tumbled to 498,000 at the start of the Korean War in 1950. Armed forces in the Islands, included in these totals, numbered 28,000 in 1940, 407,000 in 1944, and 20,000 in 1950. The influx of the early 1940s turned into a massive exodus at the end of the decade: civilian in-migrants outnumbered out-migrants by an average of 8,900 a year from 1940 to 1944, but in the six-year period that began in July 1948 there was a net civilian out-migration averaging 15,500 annually. Civilian employees of federal government went from 9,600 in 1939 to 67,000 in 1944, then fell to 22,000 by 1954. The unemployment rate averaged 0.7 percent late in the war but 11.0 percent in 1949.⁴³

It is thus not surprising that population policies and priorities underwent a complete metamorphosis. The long preoccupation with attracting foreign labor to work on the plantations, suspended since the early days of the depression, was totally abandoned. The appeal for defense workers and the build-up of the armed forces were federal responsibilities, and there was relatively little that Territorial officials could do to influence these activities, even if they had been so inclined. The postwar contraction, in contrast, provided an obvious problem for Territorial action. The situation of the preceding century was now reversed, and there were more workers than jobs.

The demographic implications of this employment decline were quickly

pointed out by two of Hawaii's best-known economists, James H. Shoemaker and Thomas K. Hitch. As early as May 1950, Shoemaker, a vice-president of the Bank of Hawaii, wrote:

There has been a marked exodus of Hawaiian residents during the past year. In spite of the fact that the excess of births over deaths currently amounts to over 900 persons per month, the population of the Territory declined from 541,000 in March, 1949, to 527,000 January 1, 1950. This exodus has the advantage of reducing unemployment and of reducing the volume of Mainland consumer goods required in Hawaii. It has certain adverse effects, however. To the extent that departing residents take funds with them, there is a decline in the financial reserves of the Territory. A decline in population decreases the potential customers of Hawaiian trade and service industries and leads to reduction in real estate values. To the extent that those leaving the islands are especially trained or able persons, there is a decrease in the human reserves of energy, initiative and capacity for expanding Hawaiian industry.

Decisions to migrate are individual decisions freely made. But by initiating action to provide transportation (by the Territory, by the Federal Government or by responsible concerns) for those who would presumably become a burden on the community, the volume of unemployment here can be reduced.⁴⁴

Hitch, then research director for the Hawaii Employers Council, called this

a new problem for Hawaii. Throughout her history until only about four years ago [1949], this question had hardly arisen. In fact the question had been how and from where can we attract more people to the Territory? . . . For an area such as this to lose more than 10% of its population by outmigration in the span of four years (or, alternatively, the possibility that it might gain 10% in the same period if the trend were the opposite, as it was in the early 1940's) creates staggering effects on employment, housing construction, etc.

In a later analysis, Hitch observed that

a situation in which population is static or declining is fraught with many hazards. . . . Higher standards of living, greater productivity, a faster pace of economic life—these things are not assured by the expanding physical market that results from a growing population, but they are much easier to achieve under those circumstances. . . . While I would never recommend that we attempt to solve our economic problems primarily through efforts to export our "surplus" population, I think we should recognize that there will be times when we will have, and should have, a net outmigration of people from Hawaii—and other times when we will have, and should have, a net immigration of people into Hawaii.⁴⁵

Hitch's emphasis on the "newness" of this problem was somewhat overstated: Hawaii had experienced an even more severe labor surplus and out-migration during the 1930s.

Both Shoemaker and Hitch agreed on the need to expand employment opportunities for the large numbers of young persons entering the labor force every year. Hitch was not particularly optimistic about the success of such an effort: "Nearly half a million people with a labor force of around 200,000 looks like about all the people that Hawaii can support in remunerative employment."⁴⁶

Not everyone was concerned over the out-migration. A newspaper editorial in April 1950 argued:

Most communities are alarmed when they learn that their population is shrinking. News that temporary residents are leaving the Territory because of the shortage of

jobs is welcome. War over-expanded the population of the Islands and the present trend is toward a balance between work and workers.

The exodus was not confined to "temporary residents," however; between 1940 and 1950, the number of Hawaii-born persons living on the Mainland more than doubled, from 23,723 to 51,955.⁴⁷

Territorial and county officials expressed considerable concern over the high unemployment rate and the need for jobs for youngsters just entering their working years, but few if any directly addressed the demographic implications of the situation. In his speech to the 1955 legislature, Governor Samuel Wilder King stated that Hawaii's "most immediate need is to provide employment . . . of a permanent nature for our growing population or face the alternative of more unemployment and the emigration of our surplus labor."⁴⁸ At least four official bodies were created to look for ways to improve the economy: the Industrial Research Advisory Council in 1949, the Governor's Full Employment Committee later that year, the Territorial Planning Board (reactivated after thirteen years) in 1954, and the Economic Planning and Coordination Authority in 1955. Although most of their efforts went toward finding new industries, one of these groups, the Full Employment Committee, "made vigorous attempts to interest West Coast employment officials in employing Hawaii's surplus workers on the mainland" and recommended "the lifting of immigration barriers so that unemployed Filipino aliens could be transported to West Coast firms."⁴⁹

Both the Territory of Hawaii and City and County of Honolulu began preparation of general plans during this period, but their publications made only passing reference to population policy alternatives. The 1953 land use report of the City Planning Commission stated: "Plans for such facilities as schools, parks, sewers, streets and highways and the like cannot be made without some knowledge of (1) how much population there will be and (2) where it will be located." Hitch's comments on the subject, cited earlier, were quoted at length. Seven years later, the Honolulu Planning Department's *General Plan* contended that a "population forecast is a beginning point and the other phases of planning are designed to implement a program to provide for the projected population."⁵⁰ The 1957 act creating the Territorial Planning Office mandated preparation of a "general plan" to include a "population density element." The resulting plan hoped to "balance the distribution of population and economic activity among the several islands" and "avoid overcrowding of residential land and undue concentration of population."⁵¹ But none of these plans mentioned the possibility that population limitation might be either desirable or feasible.

By the late 1950s the period of concern over the problems of too many workers and too few jobs had passed. The return of the 25th Infantry Division to Schofield Barracks, rapid growth in tourism, and a construction boom reduced the unemployment rate to the lowest levels since 1947 and turned the exodus of workers into a sizable net in-migration. And questions of population policy once again vanished from sight.

TOWARD POPULATION STABILIZATION

This somewhat timorous or indifferent attitude toward population control persisted until the mid-1960s. Then, within the space of a few years, everything changed. Hawaii's leaders and people developed a keen awareness of population problems, and embarked on a continuing, often heated, debate that is still in progress. Planned parenthood, legalized abortion, controlled migration, geographic redistribution, and a deliberate policy of non-growth were advanced and in some cases adopted. Hawaii became the first state in the union to create a commission to develop broad population policy.

A growing environmental concern was probably responsible for most of this changed point of view. The rapidly increasing concentration of population on Oahu was causing obvious congestion in housing, automobile traffic, parks, beaches and commercial areas. High-rise hotels and office buildings were altering the urban skyline, paving the island with concrete and blocking the view of the mountains. Air, water and noise pollution were becoming commonplace. Many suddenly realized that Hawaii was a small, isolated archipelago with finite land resources.

An increasing number of citizen groups turned their attention to this problem. One of the most active was Zero Population Growth-Honolulu, organized at the University of Hawaii in May 1969 "to bring about a condition of population stabilization within the State of Hawaii, the United States, and the world in order to preserve environmental quality for ourselves and future generations."⁵² Other groups with similar goals included Citizens for Hawaii, Life of the Land, the Sierra Club, and Save Our Surf.

As late as 1967, official State publications had carefully avoided any mention of population policy. The general plan revision program of that year, for example, accepted the projected population as given, and tailored the economic and physical plans to the scale imposed by those projections. The present author, who was responsible for the population volume in the six-volume general plan series, unsuccessfully argued with his superiors for inclusion of a section on proposed population policy. (He had lost the same battle six years earlier, while serving as research chief for the State Planning Office.)⁵³

The first break in official attitudes occurred in the area of family planning. Although the merits of birth limitation had been privately advanced for many years, governmental agencies had treated the subject with considerable caution. In September 1965, however, the Board of Health endorsed the following family planning policy:

The Hawaii State Health Department includes family planning as an integral part of its health programs, makes sufficient funds and personnel available for this purpose, and insures such freedom of choice of methods that persons of all faiths have equal opportunities to exercise their choice without offense to their consciences. Family planning is defined to include genetic counseling, fertility control, and sterility correction.⁵⁴

The department soon thereafter initiated family planning services in Nanakuli

and other low-income areas. In 1973 the Director of Health reaffirmed his concern with regard to problems of family planning and overpopulation and appointed an intra-departmental task force to review the earlier policy statement and seek ways to strengthen department efforts in this area.⁵⁵

Among private agencies, Hawaii Planned Parenthood, Inc., contributed greatly to increased public knowledge of family planning. This organization was officially chartered on August 16, 1966 and its first officers were elected the following December. In 1969 HPP received a federal grant to enable it to open and operate free family planning clinics for medically indigent persons. Two years later the State legislature appropriated \$123,560 in matching funds, the first such instance of strong legislative support for family limitation in Island history. And in a related act, the legislators voted to require the Department of Health to "furnish to each applicant for a marriage license information, to be provided by the department, relating to population stabilization, family planning, and birth control."⁵⁶

Although not advanced as a population control measure, the legalization of induced abortion in 1970 was a significant—and highly controversial—shift in state population policy. After extensive and acrimonious public debate, and over the heated opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy and other groups, the legislature voted to repeal the 120-year old prohibition on abortion, and to impose certain conditions on the performance of abortions. (These conditions required that the fetus not be "viable," that the woman be a resident of the state, and that the operation be conducted by a licensed physician or surgeon in a licensed hospital.) This act became law on March 11, 1970, without Governor Burns' signature, and Hawaii became the first state in the union to legitimize "abortion on demand."⁵⁷

Hawaii was inundated with newcomers during the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s, and by 1968 migration was perceived as a major population problem. An estimated 192,541 persons, other than military personnel and dependents, moved to Hawaii between 1960 and 1970, while only 140,095 moved away. The resulting civilian net in-migration, 52,446 for the decade, accounted for almost 40 percent of overall growth for the period. The in-migrants included both Mainlanders, estimated at 156,025, and 36,516 aliens, chiefly from the Philippines. The interstate migrants were mostly young professionals and technical workers who competed vigorously with the local population for available jobs. There was also a small but highly visible influx of hippies and surf bums, whose personal habits and tendency to swell the welfare rolls attracted considerable attention. Hardly any aged persons moved to the Islands. Almost all of the Mainlanders were Caucasians (*haole* in local parlance) and their presence portended an obvious tilt in the ethnic balance of Hawaii. Among the non-*haole* newcomers were sizable numbers of Filipinos and other Asians, who came in response to the liberalization of federal immigration laws after 1965, and many American Samoans, who as United States nationals were not subject to such restrictions. By 1970 some 45.6 percent of the resident population of Hawaii five years old or more had either been born elsewhere or had been living elsewhere five years earlier.⁵⁸

Although not technically classified as residents or migrants, tourists and other visitors contributed massively to the de facto population of the state and made up a significant percentage of the new faces on the streets and beaches. Between 1955 and 1970, visitor arrivals increased from 110,000 to 1.8 million, and the average number of visitors present in the state rose from 6,000 to 38,000. Most were middle-aged Mainland *haoles*, but a growing proportion were Japanese.⁵⁹

Governor John A. Burns, addressing the 1968 legislature, dwelt at length on the flood of visitors and new residents:

... Hawaii cries out to the nations of the Pacific and of the world, this message: "We are a free people . . . we are an open society . . . we welcome all visitors and all peoples to our Island home. . . ."

It is on this theme of the openness of our Hawaiian society that I feel privileged to address your Honorable Bodies today. . . . Let us welcome all. Let us share what this generation possesses only temporarily. Let all of America, all of our Pacific neighbors, and all the world be welcomed here.

. . . I have called your attention to a coming "new invasion of thousands of 'immigrant' workers to service our anticipated two million and three million visitors yearly" and to meet, as well, our needs in other growing industries. . . . Most of these newcomers will probably come from the Mainland. We hope, however, that we are able to attract many from other lands as well, to keep in balance the unique character of our society. Where our sister states have been primarily Europe-oriented, Hawaii has been more cosmopolitan in its general attitude because of the broader representation of peoples and cultures in our Islands. Our stock comes from the entire Pacific and Asia, as well as from the Mainland and Europe.⁶⁰

A few weeks later the legislators approved resolutions urging the U.S. Department of Justice to undertake studies, and the governor to appoint an advisory committee, "for the encouragement of such immigration into Hawaii as would continue the broad representation in this State of the peoples and cultures of East and West."⁶¹

The following legislative session requested the governor to call a conference on immigration to Hawaii, to study "the problems faced by the immigrants and by the State of Hawaii in providing services to the immigrants." In his opening remarks to the conference, called in December 1969, Governor Burns seized the opportunity to repeat and expand on his statements before the 1968 legislature:

We *are* a free people . . . we *are* an open society . . . we welcome all visitors to our islands.

At the same time, we want to keep in balance the unique character of our society, that character which makes us the envy of the world.

. . . This blending or "mix" has been a vital factor in enriching our total cultural background as well as in the harmony which characterizes our island way of life.

. . . The purpose of this conference is to consider ways in which we can encourage and attract people from throughout the Pacific community to seek better opportunities here in Hawaii.⁶²

Although the conference itself failed to follow the governor's lead, concentrating instead on social services needed by immigrants, a number of other persons voiced enthusiastic endorsement of his call for ethnic "balance." At Hawaii's first Travel Industry Conference, held in January 1970, the manager

of the Kahala Hilton Hotel urged the "importation of Asian and Pacific workers as a means of guaranteeing that Hawaii will retain its Oriental-Polynesian atmosphere." A long newspaper article by a University of Hawaii professor concluded: "Since arrivals from the Mainland cannot and should not be checked, a deliberate effort should be made to match them by Asian immigration." And an editorial in the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* referred to a statement by the present writer that a Caucasian majority was still far off as "good news for all."⁶³

Before long, however, proposed migration policy shifted sharply. Instead of viewing increased movement from the Orient and South Pacific as a corrective to the flood of Mainland *haoles*, many Islanders began to regard all in-migration, *haole* and otherwise, as undesirable.

Much of this aversion to growth through migration stemmed from a conviction that Hawaii was fast approaching a point of over-population, largely because of the continuing excess of in-migrants over out-migrants. In 1970, eleven students in the University of Hawaii Pacific Urban Studies and Planning Program, under the leadership of Prof. Tom Dinell, published a collection of their research papers under the title *Toward a Population Policy for Hawaii*. Two years later Prof. Earl Babbie issued *The Maximillion Report*. Both works proposed population ceilings for the state—Babbie specifically recommended one million—and urged that all in-migration be discouraged.⁶⁴ In 1971 the State Senate approved a resolution "establishing population equilibria as a State policy." A year later, the senators declared "a policy of achieving population stabilization by voluntary means."⁶⁵ And in 1973 the Temporary Commission on Statewide Environmental Planning, stressing the danger of "overload," referred to population as a "major factor in environmental degradation" and recommended that the state "determine optimum population levels" and "adopt strategies to limit population to the levels determined."⁶⁶

Some analysts investigated the role of tourism in population growth. A 1968 study by the present author treated vacation travel as a form of short-term migration and concluded that the qualities that attracted visitors were often the same as those that appealed to migrants.⁶⁷ The so-called Baumol Report of 1970 contended that the labor needs of the visitor industry would increasingly have to be met by new residents, who would require "substantial public outlays for the education of their children, etc." and thus drive down the hitherto favorable cost-benefit ratio found for the industry.⁶⁸ The Temporary Visitors Industry Council, created by the 1972 legislature and chaired by Thomas H. Hamilton, stated that "the unlimited expansion of the number of tourists in Hawaii is something which the fragility of our social and economic environment cannot tolerate" and recommended a strictly controlled growth policy.⁶⁹

Not surprisingly, the subjects of population growth and migration control soon became embroiled in controversy. Only four of the nineteen public officials interviewed by the University of Hawaii newspaper, *Ka Leo*, felt that even indirect control of migration was acceptable. Governor Burns saw "no reason for a limit" to population size, and Honolulu mayor Frank F. Fasi asserted that "the state could accommodate ten times the population we have

now." In a later interview the mayor (who also opposed abortion) said that "People who think they can control population . . . are wrong."⁷⁰ A 1969 *Star-Bulletin* editorial, blaming the high cost of living on Hawaii's rapid population growth, was titled "Growing Too Fast," but a 1971 editorial in the same newspaper on the anti-growth movement in the Islands was headed "Foolish Attitude."⁷¹ The *Advertiser* meanwhile supported population controls and pointed to the serious social and economic problems confronting immigrants in Hawaii—the latter of considerable concern to the State Immigration Service Center, organized in 1970 to assist aliens (and also Samoans) in adjusting to local conditions.⁷² The legal basis for migration control meanwhile came under closer scrutiny, as the state senate asked for Congressional development of interstate migration policies and reports by the East-West Population Institute and Legislative Reference Bureau questioned the constitutionality of some of the proposed measures.⁷³

The Burns administration however remained cool to suggestions for population ceilings and migration limitations, and instead espoused a policy of population redistribution. Interviewed in 1971, the governor said that "two of his major goals are to disperse population to better use the total geography of the state, and to maintain Hawaii's ethnic balance so that no one group becomes a majority." Both the governor and his cabinet repeatedly urged state action to encourage the creation of "new communities" on the Neighbor Islands, establish a second University of Hawaii campus on one of those islands, improve interisland transportation, and focus on the expansion of Neighbor Island employment opportunities.⁷⁴ The 1972 legislature responded by appropriating \$100,000 "for the development of an urban quality growth policy" and \$50,000 "for the further development of a population dispersion and growth policy."⁷⁵ Efforts to reduce congestion on densely-populated Oahu by transferring growth to the other islands were of course not new; much of the thrust of the 1961 state general plan, for example, was on reversing the 25-year decline of Neighbor Island populations.⁷⁶

Response to the proposed redistribution policy was less than enthusiastic. Robert R. Way, Honolulu planning director, had many reservations regarding its efficacy. A number of other officials, including the state director of planning and economic development, Shelley M. Mark, observed that decentralization would provide only temporary relief from the growth problem. University faculty was predictably hostile to the prospect of a forced move to a non-metropolitan setting. Raymond Suefuji, planning director for Hawaii County, "emphasized that the Neighbor Islands have a need to preserve their character and life styles, and that desire must not be undermined by transferring Honolulu's urban problems to the Neighbor Islands."⁷⁷

As the 1960s came to an end a growing number of observers perceived the need for an official, articulated set of state population policies, to be developed if possible by an authorized body of knowledgeable officials and laymen. Such a body had already been proposed at the national level by President Nixon in 1969, although no comparable state group was as yet in existence.⁷⁸ Accordingly Sen. Nadao Yoshinaga introduced a bill before the 1970 legislative

session to establish a Commission on Population Stabilization. When this bill failed to pass, he successfully substituted a senate resolution with essentially the same contents.⁷⁹ Eight months later Governor Burns appointed the nine members of the Temporary Commission on Population Stabilization requested by the resolution, and the members in turn elected Prof. Douglas Yamamura as their chairman. A resolution of the 1971 legislature extended the life of the commission and requested a final report for use by the 1972 session.⁸⁰

The commission report, signed by chairman Edward O'Rourke (who had replaced Prof. Yamamura) and the eight other members (one "with reservations"), was completed in January 1972 and submitted to the governor. The summary listed twenty-eight recommendations, bearing on basic legislative policies, population education, a permanent population commission and its suggested research and action program, family planning services, needed federal actions, state legislation, and statistical needs. Although obviously in favor of reducing both fertility and in-migration, the commission indicated considerable skepticism in regard to the possibility of determining the state's "optimum" population and establishing any direct link between population and social, economic or environmental deterioration.⁸¹

Response to the temporary commission's work ranged from apathy to outrage. Only eight days after the initial meeting of the group, Msgr. Francis A. Marzen published a scathing denunciation in the *Hawaii Catholic Herald*, applying such terms as "ridiculous," "frightening," "socialistic," "Big Brother," and "Hawaiian Roulette." Nine months later, Bishop John J. Scanlan issued a more temperately worded but still unsympathetic critique. Both Honolulu dailies noted the release of the final commission report and carried summaries of its recommendations, but otherwise the report went generally unnoticed and unread.⁸² The 1972 and 1973 legislatures eventually acted on four of the twenty-eight proposals in the report, but to little practical effect.⁸³

Two months after the Hawaii commission issued its report, the final report of the corresponding national body, the Commission on Population and the American Future, appeared, and met much the same fate. The national commission "concluded that, in the long run, no substantial benefits will result from further growth of the Nation's population, rather that the gradual stabilization of our population through voluntary means would contribute significantly to the Nation's ability to solve its problems." President Nixon, who had proposed and appointed the commission, promptly rejected some of its proposals out of hand, and the government thereafter largely ignored the report.⁸⁴

In Hawaii, interest in population policy continued at a high pitch but progress was almost imperceptible. A 1972 senate resolution requested the governor to appoint a temporary commission on population stabilization and economic growth, to carry forward the work of the previous group, but the governor failed to act. Accordingly the 1973 legislature established a permanent Commission on Population and the Hawaiian Future and appropriated

\$150,000 for its work.⁸⁵ A year later, however, the commission remained unnamed and the appropriation unspent.

Prospects for the eventual development of a comprehensive state policy were nonetheless encouraging. The 1973 law establishing a permanent commission seemed to be a model of its kind, notwithstanding the long delay in its implementation. Mainlanders were paying increasing attention to Hawaii's pioneering efforts.⁸⁶ And although the 1974 legislative session made little progress in population matters, a growing proportion of Island residents appeared to be aware of the need for official action. Whether the state policy expected eventually to emerge resembled that visualized by the temporary commission, or, indeed, any of the policies of the past 150 years, was of course problematical.

NOTES

- ¹ The Commission on Population and the American Future, *Population and the American Future* (Washington, 1972), pp. 139-140; *Report of the Temporary Commission on Population Stabilization, State of Hawaii* (Honolulu, January 1972), pp. 83-89.
- ² For a discussion of definitions, see George B. Baldwin's review of Bernard Berelson, ed., *Population Policy in Developed Countries*, in *Finance and Development*, Vol. 10, No. 4, December 1973, pp. 3-4.
- ³ Robert C. Schmitt, *Demographic Statistics of Hawaii: 1778-1965* (Honolulu, 1968), Chapters I, II and III, and "New Estimates of the Pre-Censal Population of Hawaii," *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 80, No. 2, June 1971, pp. 237-243.
- ⁴ William Ellis, *A Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii, or Owhyhee . . .*, reprint of the London 1827 edition (Honolulu, 1917), p. 247.
- ⁵ Lorrin A. Thurston, ed., *The Fundamental Law of Hawaii* (Honolulu, 1904), pp. 105-106; Artemas Bishop, "An inquiry into the causes of decrease in the Population of the Sandwich Islands," *The Hawaiian Spectator*, Vol. I, No. 1, January 1838, pp. 52-66, espec. pp. 57-58. The 1835 laws was replaced in 1850 by one making no specific mention of infanticide; see *Penal Code of the Hawaiian Islands . . . 1850*, Chapter LV, Sect. 1, and Chapter VII.
- ⁶ *Penal Code . . . 1850*, Chapter XII; *Session Laws of Hawaii* (hereafter S.L.H.), 1970, Act 1.
- ⁷ Thurston, *Fundamental Law*, pp. 36-38 and 126-130; *100th Anniversary Report, Board of Health, 1850-1950* (Honolulu, 1950), pp. 2-3.
- ⁸ Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II (Honolulu, 1953), pp. 69-71, 73, and 75.
- ⁹ Hospital Costs Study Committee, *Hospital Costs in Hawaii* (Honolulu, 1949), pp. 10-13 and 44.
- ¹⁰ Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I (Honolulu, 1938), p. 387.
- ¹¹ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, p. 69.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 243-244; HG, November 18, 1874, p. 2; "Charter of Incorporation of the Kapiolani Home of the Hooulu and Hoola Lahui Society," *Articles of Association and Charters of Incorporation*, Book No. 4, pp. 128-130 (AH); anon., *A Brief History of the Kapiolani Maternity Home* (Honolulu, 1929?), pp. 2-3.

- ¹³ Schmitt, *Demographic Statistics*, pp. 39-40; *Penal Code . . . 1850*, pp. 154-155; *The Civil Code of the Hawaiian Islands . . . 1859*, Sect. 1491; S.L.H. 1864-1865, p. 59, S.L.H. 1887, Chapter XXXIV.
- ¹⁴ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, pp. 171 and 275.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 327-329; *Report of the President of the Bureau of Immigration . . . 1886*, pp. 4-5; Andrew W. Lind, *Hawaii's People* (Honolulu, 1955), pp. 4-5.
- ¹⁶ See, for example, Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, pp. 177, 179 and 180, and Vol. III (Honolulu, 1967), p. 117.
- ¹⁷ *Penal Code . . . 1850*, pp. 170-176; *Civil Code . . . 1859*, Sect. 1396-1424 and 1491; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, p. 330.
- ¹⁸ S.L.H. 1864-1865, pp. 59-60; *Compiled Laws of the Hawaiian Kingdom* (1884), pp. 516-518; *Report of the President of the Bureau of Immigration . . . 1886*, pp. 16-17; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, p. 180.
- ¹⁹ *Report of the President of the Bureau of Immigration . . . 1886*, p. 279; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, pp. 159, 165, and 171.
- ²⁰ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, p. 189, and Vol. III, pp. 116-117 and 144; *Report of the President of the Bureau of Immigration . . . 1886*, pp. 7 and 30.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 9-10, and 247; *Compiled Laws*, p. 518; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, pp. 181-183 and 190, and Vol. III, pp. 126-127 and 159-160.
- ²² *Report of the President of the Bureau of Immigration . . . 1886*, pp. 7, 9, 30 and 195; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, pp. 76 and 192-193, and Vol. III, pp. 137 and 144; *First Report of the Board of Immigration . . . 1907*, p. 5.
- ²³ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, p. 147; Lind, *Hawaii's People*, p. 30.
- ²⁴ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, pp. 185-191, and Vol. III, pp. 137, 174-176, 178, and 183-185.
- ²⁵ Schmitt, *Demographic Statistics*, p. 165.
- ²⁶ S.L.H. 1905, Act 49; S.L.H. 1909, Act 33; S.L.H. 1911, Act 123; *First Report of the Board of Immigration . . . 1907*; *Fifth Report of the Board of Immigration, Labor and Statistics . . . 1916*, p. 5; *Report of the Governor of Hawaii . . . 1917*, p. 39; S.L.H. 1931, Act 97; *Senate Journal . . . 1955*, p. 484; *House Journal . . . 1955*, pp. 727-728; S.L.H. 1955, Act 22.
- ²⁷ *Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration to the Secretary of Labor . . . 1914*, p. 12.
- ²⁸ 42 U.S. Statutes 5-7 (1921); 43 U.S. Statutes 153-169 (1924); Maldwyn Allen Jones, *American Immigration* (Chicago and London, 1960), pp. 204-205 and 276-277; Frank L. Auerbach, *Immigration Laws of the United States*, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis and New York, 1961), pp. 6-10; *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1973*, 94th ed., pp. 91-92 and 94.
- ²⁹ *Labor Problems in Hawaii. Hearings Before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, 67th Congress, 1st Session . . . 1921*, pp. 213, 224 and 225.
- ³⁰ 48 U.S. Statutes 456-465 (1933-1934); Jones, *American Immigration*, pp. 288-289; Auerbach, *Immigration Laws*, p. 13; Lind, *Hawaii's People*, p. 30.
- ³¹ Schmitt, *Demographic Statistics*, pp. 10, 43, 120, 127 and 223.
- ³² Jonathan T. McDonald, *The New Science of Eugenics*, reprinted from the Transactions of the Medical Society of Hawaii, 1911; Uldrick Thompson, *Eugenics for Parents and Teachers* (Medical Society of Hawaii, 1915); Edgar Eugene Brooks, *The Next Step* (read before the Honolulu Social Science Society, March 5, 1917).
- ³³ L. J. Warren, "An Open Letter to All Institutions, Judges and the Thoughtful People of Hawaii," *F*, February 1933, pp. 31-32.
- ³⁴ "Dr. Larsen Advocates Birth Control and Sterilization [sic] to Save Race from Destruction," *HA*, December 12, 1931, p. 8; "Sterilization Is Advocated," *HSB*, January 9, 1937, p. 3.

- ³⁵ H.B. 181, cited in Thompson, *Eugenics*, p. 25.
- ³⁶ Margaret M. L. Catton, *Social Service in Hawaii* (Palo Alto, 1959), p. 66.
- ³⁷ Nils P. Larsen et al., "Summary of Eugenics Bill by Drafting Committee," F, February 1933, pp. 32-33; *Senate Journal . . . 1933*, pp. 119, 127, 188, 191, 202-204, and 354; *Journal of the House of Representatives . . . 1933*, pp. 486 and 1384.
- ³⁸ Ira V. Hiscock, *A Survey of Health and Welfare Activities in Honolulu, Hawaii* (New Haven, 1929), p. 80.
- ³⁹ *The Queen's Hospital Bulletin*, Vol. XIII, Nos. 6-10, January-June 1938, pp. 7 and 24-25; "Limit on Birth to Lift Family Health Urged," HSB, May 7, 1938, pp. 1 and 4; Nils P. Larsen, "A Plantation Study in Health," *The Journal of Contraception*, Vol. 3, No. 10, October 1938, pp. 171-177, and "Analysis of certain factors entering into the material welfare of families," *Proceedings, Hawaiian Academy of Science, Thirteenth Annual Meeting, 1937-1938* (Honolulu, 1939), p. 20.
- ⁴⁰ Nils P. Larsen, "A Plantation Study in Health," pp. 174-176.
- ⁴¹ Ira V. Hiscock, *A Survey of Public Health Activities in Honolulu, Hawaii* (Honolulu?, 1935), pp. 94 and 143; Palama Settlement, *Palama Settlement's 38th Year of Concern for Honolulu's Needful, 1933* (Honolulu, 1934?), section on "Family Limitation Service"; anon., "A Community Problem," *The Queen's Hospital Bulletin*, Vol. IX, Nos. 1-3, June-August 1932, entire issue; Philip S. Platt, "Planned Parenthood at Palama Settlement," HSB, May 6, 1938, p. 8.
- ⁴² "Confab Passes Resolution on Birth Control," HSB, July 24, 1931, p. 1; "Church Sends Questionnaire to Nominees," HSB, October 25, 1934, p. 8; "Birth Control Approval Hit," HA, September 7, 1937, pp. 1 and 11; Catton, *Social Service*, p. 102.
- ⁴³ Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development, *The State of Hawaii Data Book 1973: A Statistical Abstract* (1973), pp. 8, 126 and 175; Schmitt, *Demographic Statistics*, p. 187.
- ⁴⁴ Bank of Hawaii, Department of Business Research, *The Economy of Hawaii Today* (Honolulu, May 1, 1950), p. 23.
- ⁴⁵ Hawaii Employers Council, *The Hawaiian Economy in 1952*, Research Bulletin 53-1, March 6, 1953, pp. 22-23, and *Hawaii's Economic Outlook*, Research Bulletin 54-1, November 22, 1954, p. 7.
- ⁴⁶ Bank of Hawaii, Department of Business Research, *Men, Land and Jobs in Hawaii* (Honolulu, June 1, 1952), p. 11; Hawaii Employers Council, *Hawaii's Economic Outlook*, p. 3.
- ⁴⁷ "Welcome Population Shrinkage," HA, April 19, 1950, p. 6; Schmitt, *Demographic Statistics*, pp. 122 and 183.
- ⁴⁸ *Senate Journal . . . 1955*, p. 9.
- ⁴⁹ Hawaii Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, *Report on Programs Designed to Improve the Economy of Hawaii and to Alleviate Unemployment* (mimeo., February 11, 1954), p. 8; *Final Report on the Activities of the Territorial Planning Board for the Biennium Period, 1954-1955 (Total 18 Months)* (typescript, 1955, AH).
- ⁵⁰ Honolulu City Planning Commission, *Land Use and Zoning, City of Honolulu, 1953* (n.d.), pp. 18 and 29-35; Honolulu Planning Department, *General Plan for Urban and Urbanizing Areas* (August 1960), p. 17.
- ⁵¹ Hawaii State Planning Office, *The General Plan of the State of Hawaii* (January 1961), p. 5; Hawaii State Department of Planning and Research, *State Planning in Hawaii, 1957-61* (April 1, 1961), p. 11.
- ⁵² Untitled statement by Sheila Babbie, Vice President, Zero Population Growth-Honolulu (multilithed, March 1971); *ZPG Newsletter* (Honolulu), Vol. 3, No. 8, September 14, 1971; 1974 Legislature, H.R. No. 498.
- ⁵³ Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development, *State of Hawaii General Plan Revision Program, Part 1, Elements of the State Planning Process: A*

Summary Volume (1967), p. 19, and Part 4, *Population Projections* (1967); Hawaii State Planning Office, *The General Plan*.

⁵⁴ Walter B. Quisenberry, M.D., *Family Planning Policy and Priority* (memorandum to all Department of Health staff members, October 2, 1973).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ "Planned Parenthood Group Started Here," HSB, December 21, 1966, p. A-1A; S.L.H. 1971, Acts 89 and 172; letter from Cosette Mulder, Executive Director, Hawaii Planned Parenthood, Inc., to Robert Schmitt, January 7, 1974.

⁵⁷ S.L.H. 1970, Act 1. The repealed law was *Hawaii Revised Statutes*, Sect. 768-6, which was initially enacted as part of the *Penal Code . . . 1850*, Chapter XII. For other laws bearing on abortion, see H.R.S., Sects. 442-9(1), 453-8(1), 455-6(4) (A), and 460-12(1). For a list of contemporary newspaper articles describing the abortion controversy, see the Hawaii State Department of Education, Office of Library Services, *Index to the Honolulu Advertiser and Honolulu Star-Bulletin 1970* (1973), pp. 1-2.

⁵⁸ For statistics on migration, see the U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1970*, Subject Reports, Final Report PC(2)-2D, *Lifetime and Recent Migration* (1973), table 10, pp. 55-56; Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development, *The State of Hawaii Data Book 1973*, pp. 30-32 and 37-39, and *Hawaii's In-Migrants, 1972* (Statistical Report 94, April 15, 1973); Hawaii State Department of Health and Department of Planning and Economic Development, "Population Mobility in Hawaii during 1971," *Population Report*, No. 1 (April 1973); and Robert C. Schmitt, "Migration Statistics in an Island State: The Hawaii Experience," *The American Statistician*, Vol. 22, No. 2, April 1968, pp. 20-23. For legislation, see 66 U.S. Statutes 163-28 (1952) and 79 U.S. Statutes 911-922 (1965), and *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1973*, loc. cit.

⁵⁹ *The State of Hawaii Data Book 1973*, pp. 142-144.

⁶⁰ *Journal of the House of Representatives . . . 1968*, pp. 9 and 11; "Hawaii Must Remain an Open Society," HSB, February 23, 1968, p. A-11.

⁶¹ 1968 Legislature, H.C.R. No. 39 and 41.

⁶² 1969 Legislature, H.C.R. No. 45; Governor's Conference on Immigration, Honolulu, December 11 and 12, 1969, *Proceedings*, Vol. I, pp. 35-36.

⁶³ "Harmonious Mix," HSB, December 11, 1969, p. A-24; HA, January 8, 1970, p. 1, and January 12, 1970, p. D-1; George Z. F. Bereday, "Keeping Racial Mix Vital to Hawaii's Future," HA, January 12, 1970, p. A-15.

⁶⁴ Pacific Urban Studies and Planning Program, *Toward a Population Policy for Hawaii* (Honolulu, 1970); "Population Curbs Urged by Students," HA, January 27, 1971, p. A-18; Earl R. Babbie, *The Maximillion Report* (Honolulu, 1972), pp. 53 and 55.

⁶⁵ 1971 Legislature, S.R. No. 239; 1972 Legislature, S.R. No. 303.

⁶⁶ Temporary Commission on Statewide Environmental Planning, *A Plan for Hawaii's Environment* (November 6, 1973), pp. 8 and 13.

⁶⁷ Robert C. Schmitt, "Travel, Tourism, and Migration," *Demography*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1968, pp. 306-310.

⁶⁸ Mathematica, *The Visitor Industry and Hawaii's Economy: A Cost-Benefit Analysis* (Princeton, N. J., February 20, 1970), pp. 3, 181 and 184.

⁶⁹ *The Report of the Temporary Visitor Industry Council* (November 1973), pp. i, ii, 15, 24, and 75-76.

⁷⁰ Allie Lorch, "Officials Air Views on Hawaii's Growth," *Ka Leo o Hawaii*, September 13, 1971, pp. 6-7; June Watanabe, "The Mayor's View: Today and Tomorrow," SSBA, May 4, 1973, pp. 1 and A-6; Beverly Creamer, "Fasi Says Haoles Are Bias Victims," HSB, January 11, 1974.

⁷¹ HSB, September 10, 1969 and July 6, 1971.

- ⁷² Editorials, "The Tourism Issue" and "The Immigrant Issues," SSBA, December 2, 1973, p. A-22; Hawaii State Commission on Manpower and Full Employment, *Report of the State Immigration Service Center* (January 1972).
- ⁷³ 1972 Legislature, S.R. No. 301; Peter B. Maggs, *Legal Regulation of Population Movement to, from, and within the United States—A Survey of Current Law and Constitutional Limitations* (Working Papers of the East-West Population Institute, Paper No. 25, June 1972); David R. Hood and Bella Z. Bell, *In-Migration as a Component of Hawaii Population Growth: Its Legal Implications* (Legislative Reference Bureau, Report No. 2, 1973).
- ⁷⁴ Lorch, "Officials Air Views"; *Address by Governor John A. Burns, Joint Session, Sixth Hawaii State Legislature, January 21, 1971* (typescript, AH). "State Planner Outlines Six Goals for the '70s," HSB, May 10, 1971, p. A-8; "2nd Oahu UH Campus Opposed," HSB, May 22, 1971; "Burns Hopes to Disperse Population," HA, June 2, 1971, p. A-14; "Population Dispersal Held Vital," HSB, June 17, 1971; Harold Hostetler, "Neighbor Isle Views Mixed on Population Dispersal," HA, November 5, 1971, p. B-1; Gerry Keir, "Population's the Issue in State's Stand on UH Campus Sites," HA, December 6, 1971, pp. B-7 and B-8; "Ariyoshi Calls for Care in Spending," HSB, January 24, 1974, pp. A-1 and A-11.
- ⁷⁵ S.L.H. 1972, Act 202.
- ⁷⁶ Hawaii State Planning Office, *The General Plan*. See also Ron Bennett, "Big Isle Moves to Keep Youth Home as Population Falls," HA, October 27, 1957, p. A-10.
- ⁷⁷ Lorch, "Officials Air Views"; Hostetler, "Neighbor Isle Views"; Keir, "Population's the Issue."
- ⁷⁸ The Commission on Population and the American Future, *Population*, pp. 3 and 8.
- ⁷⁹ 1970 Legislature, S.B. 1633 and S.R. 355. The latter appears in *Report of the Temporary Commission on Population Stabilization*, pp. 57-58.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7 and 59; 1971 Legislature, S.R. 345.
- ⁸¹ *Report of the Temporary Commission on Population Stabilization*, pp. 1-4, 26-27, and 31-46.
- ⁸² "Catholic Editor Blasts Burns Population Study," HSB, February 4, 1971, p. B-6; "Editor's Thinking out loud," *Hawaii Catholic Herald*, February 5, 1971; *Report of the Temporary Commission on Population Stabilization*, pp. 97-97i; Jerry Burris, "Far-Reaching Report on How to Check Population Growth," HA, January 22, 1972, p. A-8; Dave Shapiro, "Full-time Isle Population Study Is Urged," HSB, January 22, 1972.
- ⁸³ 1972 Legislature, S.R. No. 301 and 302; S.L.H. 1973, Acts 103 and 204. S.R. No. 301 requested the Hawaii Congressional delegation to ask the Congress to assist with the development of interstate migration policies and regulations and to establish a timetable for the eventual reduction of immigration into the United States. S.R. No. 302 urged full funding of the National Family Planning Act of 1970 by Congress. Act 103 provided for the collection of data on persons entering or leaving the State, but the funds needed for its implementation were later withheld. Act 204 established a State Commission on Population and the Hawaiian Future (discussed below).
- ⁸⁴ The Commission on Population and the American Future, *Population*, p. 4; Charles F. Westoff, "The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future: Its Origins, Operations, and Aftermath," *Population Index*, Vol. 39, No. 4, October 1973, pp. 491-507, espec. pp. 501-502.
- ⁸⁵ 1972 Legislature, S.R. No. 304; S.L.H. 1973, Act 204.
- ⁸⁶ See, for example, Tadd Fisher, "Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise," *Population Bulletin*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1973.

Acknowledgment: Andrew W. Lind read the first draft of this paper and made many helpful suggestions.